

LEGAL & GENERAL ASSURANCE SOCIETY LIMITED.

Head Office:

10, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Near Temple Bar.

Estd.



1836.

Trustees:

THE RIGHT HON. SIR ARTHUR CHANNEILL,
THE RIGHT HON. LORD BLANESBURGH,
ROMER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P.,
CHARLES P. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.

Subscribed Capital - - - £1,000,000
Paid-up Capital - - - £160,000
Assets exceed - - - £15,500,000

ALL CLASSES OF INSURANCE
TRANSACTIONED, EXCEPT MARINE.

General Manager:

W. A. WORKMAN, F.I.A.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, AUGUST 23, 1924.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

£2 12s.; by Post, £2 14s.; Foreign, £2 16s.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

. The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS	893	SOCIETIES	900
MISTAKE IN CONNECTION WITH CONTRACTS FOR THE SALE AND PURCHASE OF LAND	895	STOCK EXCHANGE PRICES OF CERTAIN TRUSTEE SECURITIES	903
REVIEWS	896	LEGAL NEWS	903
BOOKS OF THE WEEK	898	WINDING-UP NOTICES	904
MINISTRY OF HEALTH	898	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	904
NEW RULES	898		

Case Reported this Week.

Farrant v. Caley 898

Current Topics.

The New Statutes.

WE COMMENCE printing this week the Statutes of the past session of Parliament. The Treaty of Peace with Turkey Act is a somewhat belated conclusion to the legislative sanctions required for what should be the Peace Settlement; though, in fact, that settlement is still in progress, and it may be hoped, whatever doubt is felt over the Ruhr business, that a really considerable step is represented by the results of the London Conference. Of other Acts it is sufficient to mention the National Health Insurance (Cost of Medical Benefit) Act, which is intended to assist the carrying out of the present arrangement with the doctors; the County Courts Act, which makes important changes as to the appointment, remuneration, and conditions of service of the registrars and inferior officers of county courts; the Prevention of Eviction Act, which is the sole survivor from the wreckage of this year's attempts to deal with Rent Restriction, and complicates still further an already over-complicated system; the Finance Act, which repeals the Inhabited House Duty and terminates the Corporation Profits Tax, but leaves Income Tax at 4s. 6d. in the £, and allows the tax, where less than £50, to be recovered summarily as a civil debt; the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act, which (*pace SCRUTTON, L.J.*) is intended to adjust the question of liability between shipowners and shippers, and to prevent the former from evading their proper liability; the Conveyancing (Scotland) Act, which introduces simplifications in the conveyancing system of our northern friends; the London Traffic Act, which is a well-intended measure for the removal of blocks in London streets; the Housing (Financial Provisions) Act, which is an addition to the numerous Housing Acts—a Consolidation Bill is before Parliament—and must await the test of experience for judgment to be passed on it; and the Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, which goes some way to restore the Wages Boards set up by the Corn Production Act, 1917, but abolished by the Corn Production Acts (Repeal) Act, 1921. The contest over this last Act has been between central and local control, and the advocates of local control have won.

The Unfinished Legislation.

BUT WHILE the output of the session has been considerable, there are important measures left over. The Administration of Justice Bill and Criminal Justice Bill, which passed the House of Lords early in the year, still await consideration in the House of Commons on the Reports of the Standing Committee. The Guardianship of Infants and Legitimacy Bills—there have been rival Bills in the two Houses—have not yet resulted in statutes, though it should have been possible to adjust the differences on certain points in legitimation and pass either Lord BUCKMASTER or Col. CAMPION's Bill. The principle of legitimation by subsequent marriage is now generally admitted. As regards guardianship, Lord HALDANE's Bill seems now to have the Parliamentary advantage over Mrs. WINTRINGHAM's. And the Building Materials Bill, which is the complement to the Housing (Financial Provisions) Act, and is intended to prevent the public money from being absorbed in building merchants' profits, has not been passed. These *remnants* should be disposed of in the Autumn Session, and it may be hoped that the Law of Property Consolidation Bills will then be passed as agreed measures. If there is discussion on them, they will probably have to go over to next year. The War Charges (Validity) Bill, if not dead, is in a state of suspended animation, and it is one of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's problems how he can revive it. The motion for the appointment of additional judges should have been taken before the recess, so as to enable the judges to be appointed and be at work when the Courts sit. But this has been deferred till the Autumn Session when apparently it will be the first business.

The Settled Land (Consolidation) Bill.

OF THE SEVEN Bills for consolidating the Law of Property introduced by the Lord Chancellor on 31st July, one has now been issued. This is the Settled Land (Consolidation) Bill (196), 5s. net. It contains 121 clauses and six Schedules, and it consolidates the Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890, and the parts of the Law of Property Act, 1922, dealing with settled land. We do not, however, propose to comment on it until more of the Bills are available. We do not quarrel with the piecemeal issue of the Bills, for that is doubtless due to the necessities of the draftsman and the printer; but the one which is really required first is the Law of Property Amendment Bill, for that should make all the changes in the Act of 1922, and other statutes, which are a condition precedent to consolidation. To show that this Bill should come first we may refer to the last item in the Sixth Schedule to the Settled Land Bill (the Schedule of Repeals), which repeals s. 4 and the Fourth Schedule of "the Law of Property (Amendment) Act, 1924." Now, until the text of the Bill which is to be the last Act is available, we do not know what are s. 4 and the Fourth Schedule, or how they affect the Settled Land Bill. Then again, the chief point for consideration relates to s. 3 of the Act of 1922, a most difficult section to which we have frequently called attention and urged its impracticability. We see that the Sixth Schedule of the present Bill repeals this section "so far as it relates to equitable interests and powers arising under a settlement." And since this part of s. 3 does not appear to be transferred to the Settled Land Bill—which would be a proper course if it was to be retained—we presume it has gone. Does this mean that our criticism has been accepted and s. 3 thrown over altogether? That we cannot tell until we have the Amendment Bill and the Law of Property (Consolidation) Bill. So it would be inconvenient to start a consideration of a single Bill by itself. In the main, however, the Settled Land Bill is a consolidation of the well-known provisions of the Settled Land Acts with the changes which have long been recognised as necessary—so long ago as the Settled Land Bill of 1906. Of these, the most important relate to "compound settlements." The main alteration made by the Act of 1922 was in the introduction of vesting deeds and the requirement that settlements shall consist of two instruments—the trust deed, or in the case of a will, the will, and the vesting instrument,

the latter vesting the legal fee simple in the tenant for life and naming the trustees, so that a purchaser will not, in general, be concerned to look beyond the vesting instrument.

The Council's Report.

WE CONCLUDE this week the extracts we have been printing from the Annual Report of the Council of The Law Society. It will have been seen with interest that 2nd June, 1825, was the date of the founding of The Law Society, and that a Special Committee has been appointed by the Council to consider how the Centenary next year shall be celebrated. The establishment of local Law Schools—a work which has been necessitated by the Solicitors Act, 1922—goes on steadily. The old schools have been strengthened and new ones opened. In connection with the Land Registry there is an important proposal pending that counsel who advise purchasers on title should be asked to give a certificate on which the Registrar could register an absolute title. The Council are now considering the form of certificate which counsel should give. The Law of Property Act, 1922, provides in Sched. XVI, Part I, s. 25 (b) for rules to be made enabling the Registrar, without further investigation, to accept such certificates, and we presume that the present suggestion is in anticipation of such rules. The Report contains an important record of the efforts which have been made by the Council to secure that persons appointed to be solicitors to Government Departments shall be solicitors. This seems sufficiently obvious, and successive Lord Chancellors—Lords BIRKENHEAD, CAVE and HALDANE—have agreed to it, but the heads of certain Departments appoint barristers. Of course, the question depends on the services required. A legal adviser may very well be a barrister, and the term "solicitor" should then be dropped. If he is required to do more than advise and exercise a solicitor's functions, he should, of course, be a solicitor. It appears that the Committee on Crown Procedure has not yet concluded its labours. We understood that it had reported, but that the Report had been kept secret. We are afraid that there are too many Crown lawyers on the Committee for much to be expected from it. In the section of the Council's Report dealing with the Administration of Justice Bill, which defines the qualification of the Master in Lunacy and Taxing Masters and other officers of the Supreme Court, there is a very interesting sketch of the origin of the modern taxing authority, and the Council record their efforts to have both the Lunacy and Taxing Masterships confined to practising solicitors. In the House of Lords these efforts were not successful, but the matter has still to be considered in the House of Commons. The Report is a very informing summary of the activities of the Council during the past year.

Murder Trials in America.

THE CURIOUS tactics adopted by the defence in the Chicago Millionaire Students murder case has excited some attention among Old Bailey practitioners. The defending counsel offered a plea of "Guilty" on behalf of his clients, and this was accepted by the trial judge after some interrogation of the defendants to satisfy himself that they were fit to plead, and understand the consequences of their plea. This, however, did not conclude the matter. The issue of the proper sentence was then raised, for in nearly all American States capital punishment does not follow automatically on a verdict or plea of murder: there is a discretion in the court which is hedged round by conditions varying in different States. It is therefore necessary, notwithstanding the plea, to hear all the evidence just as if there had been a trial in order to ascertain the degree of guilt, and the consequent penalty. The plea of "Guilty" therefore seems at first sight an unnecessary one on the part of the defence; but in the State of Wisconsin, which has jurisdiction in the Chicago murder, there is a special peculiarity which makes the plea important. For in Wisconsin, by a local statute, it appears, where there is a plea of "Not Guilty" in homicide cases, the jury not only find the verdict, but also assess the sentence, which may be (1) death, (2) penal servitude for life, and (3) some

lesse
the
but
"Gu
ju
to p
As
mo
in th
it is
The
grou
the p
the p
he w
date
try in
the is
is not

Police

AN
on the
at Bow
Long
course,
attenti
discuss
come l
precise
to direc
the pro
object
declare
highwa
directio
travelli
summo
"wilful
an offer
The use
by the l
importa
Act, 18
Managem
any exp
of traffic
"obstru
Common
King's L
strictly c
at "poi
always b
In excep
similar p
is obscur

The Dis

A FOR
Law was
sittings i
of the M
for electi
by himse
or employ
s-s. (2) h
having an
company
or under
question

lesser punishment. Where, however, there is a plea of "Guilty," the jury is "*functus officio*," and the judge then assesses sentence, but in accordance with the same principles. By pleading "Guilty," the prisoners avoided assessment of the penalty by the jury, which was supposed—rightly or wrongly—rather likely to prove vindictive against millionaires accused of murder. As American lawyers have much experience in gauging the moods of juries, and are said to possess methods not available in this country for guessing the attitude of the jury beforehand, it is possible that defending counsel showed a wise discretion. The judge, however, ruled out a defence of "insanity" on the ground that he had already made a finding of sanity in accepting the prisoners' plea. A plea, "Guilty of Murder," implies that the prisoner was sane at the time of the offence, for otherwise he would not be guilty of murder; and he must be sane at the date of the plea, or otherwise it would be the judge's duty to try instead the issue of his fitness to plead. But, although the issue of insanity is ruled out, the trial judge has agreed to hear evidence of "deficiency in moral responsibility," since this is not in law "insanity," but may affect sentence.

Police Control of Traffic.

AN INTERESTING problem in police law seems likely to arise on the summons granted by Sir CHARTRES BIRON on Tuesday at Bow Street to Mr. A. H. HASTIE against a constable on duty in Long Acre. Until the case has been heard and determined, of course, we cannot comment on the issues of law involved; but attention may properly be drawn to the fact that a point, long discussed among local government practitioners, has at last come before a court for decision. The question in issue is the precise powers of the police to control traffic, and in particular to direct it to pass along certain routes when others are open; in the present case the Commissioner of Police—acting with the object of reducing the congestion of London street traffic—has declared Long Acre to be a "one-way" thoroughfare, *i.e.*, a highway along which traffic is allowed to pass only in one direction. A constable stopped the complainant, who was travelling in the opposite direction, and the latter took out a summons against the constable on the ground that his act "wilfully obstructed the free passage of the highway," which is an offence under various sections of the Highways Act, 1835. The user of highways is controlled as regards the country at large by the Highways Act, 1835, and later amending statutes of small importance; as regards boroughs by the Town Police Clauses Act, 1857; and as regards London by the various Metropolitan Management Acts. None of these directly confers on the police any express power to open or close streets to any particular form of traffic. Of course, there is a general power and duty to prevent "obstruction" of the highway vested in the constabulary at Common Law: this is one form of "preventing a breach of the King's Peace." But the limits of this power have never been strictly defined. How far the police method of regulating traffic at "points" and "crossings" is really authorised by law has always been a matter of speculation among legal practitioners. In exceptional cases local statutes or bye-laws give this and other similar powers; but the origin of the general power, if it exists, is obscure.

The Disqualification of Borough Councillors.

A POINT of considerable importance in Local Government Law was decided by Mr. Justice BAILHACHE at the end of the sittings in *Lepish v. Braithwaite*, 40 T.L.R. 857. Under s. 12 (1) of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, a person is disqualified for election as a borough councillor if he has directly or indirectly, by himself or his partner, any share or interest in any contract or employment with, by, or on behalf of the council; but under s. 2 he is not to be so disqualified "by reason only of his having any share or interest in . . . any railway company, or any company incorporated by Act of Parliament or Royal Charter, or under the Companies Act, 1862." In the above case the question was whether the defendant, who was a shareholder in

and also managing director of a company, was protected by s. 2, but the learned judge laid stress on the word "only." Merely as a shareholder in a company, a councillor has no influence in its contracts, but as managing director he may have such influence, and the reason for exempting him ceases. Accordingly, BAILHACHE, J., held that the defendant, who was an alderman of the City of Leeds, and subject therefore to the same disqualification as a councillor, was disqualified by being managing director of a company which had contracts with the corporation, and the same would seem to apply to an ordinary director.

Mistake in Connection with Contracts for the Sale of Land.

I.

THE Privy Council has now (*United States v. Motor Trucks, Ltd.*, 1924, A.C.196), decided in the affirmative that a Court of Equity can at one and the same time (a) reform a contract, and (b) decree specific performance thereof as reformed. The point has been the subject of controversy for many years. So long ago as 1911, in the 5th edition of the late Sir EDWARDS FRY's book on *Specific Performance*, edited by the late Mr. W. D. RAWLINS, Q.C., in para. 816, the view was expressed that the court has this power by virtue of s. 24 of the Judicature Act, 1873. Since that date there have been decisions both ways, and then, in 1922, came the decision of P. O. LAWRENCE, J., in *Craddock Bros. v. Hunt*, 1922, 2 Ch. 809, which was affirmed by the Court of Appeal, 1923, 2 Ch. 136, agreeing with the statement above referred to in Sir EDWARD FRY's book. Mr. T. CYPRIAN WILLIAMS, in the 2nd edition of his book on *Vendors and Purchasers*, and also in the 3rd edition, issued since this decision, at pp. 771 to 777, shows clearly that the opinion of Sir EDWARD FRY must be right. Finally we have the decision of the Privy Council above referred to.

The law of "Mistake" as affecting contracts presents many fine distinctions, and even apparent contradictions and anomalies. There is, indeed, something of an anomaly in the rule of common law which forms the very basis of the law of mistake. By this rule, as is well known, to effect a valid contract, there must be the true, full and free consent of the parties; consequently, when owing to a mistake the parties' minds are not at one, there can be no true consent, and therefore no contract. But the rule has to be read with this very important exception, namely, that every man must be taken to intend the natural and reasonable consequences of his acts. The result is, that where the mistake is on the part of one only of the parties, he will not be allowed to say, after signing a contract, that he did not give his true, full and free consent thereto, and thus avoid his liability thereunder. As a matter of fact, in practice, the cases covered by the exception are far more numerous than the cases covered by the rule. And this is where the anomaly comes in, for we get the curious result that the exception becomes the *real rule* and the rule the *real exception*.

Another somewhat curious rule, which, in its present form, seems to have been formulated by Lord WESTBURY in 1867, is that the well-known maxim that ignorance of the law is no excuse, means ignorance of the *general law*, and that a mistake made in ignorance of the law of *private rights* may be a perfectly good defence. It may be asked where is the line to be drawn? It would seem not to be impossible to conceive a case where the law as to which the mistake has been made may be both the general law of the land and the law as to private rights. Again, the rules as to the admissibility of evidence in connection with the construction of ambiguous terms in a contract often seem contradictory. For instance, in one section of cases the general rule is laid down that where there is ambiguity in a contract, it is the duty of the court to construe the meaning from the terms of the contract itself without the assistance of the parties or of extrinsic evidence; and in another class of cases we find it stated

that where the latent ambiguity in the contract consists of a word or expression capable of two meanings, it is not for the court to construe the ambiguity, but for the plaintiff seeking to establish the contract to make out his case with the help of extrinsic evidence. Another matter which it is often difficult to determine is, under what circumstances a contract will be considered void and when only voidable. If a man is induced to sign a contract for the sale of land by being made to think he is signing a document of an entirely different nature and character, the contract would undoubtedly be void, just as if his signature had been forged, unless, being under a duty to the other party to the contract to use care in signing, he has been negligent in this respect. But if his signature to the contract was obtained by a fraudulent misrepresentation as to some fact other than the nature and character thereof, then apparently it would not be void, but only voidable. The distinction, of course, is important. If it is void, it is as if it never existed. If it is only voidable the party can elect either to treat the contract as void or good, whichever would suit him the better. The curious point is, that in both cases the document was signed under a mistaken notion of the facts of the case, and in neither case could it be said that the mind of the person signing went with his signature, and yet in the one case the contract is void and in the other only voidable.

Then, again, the law as to the effect of the silence of the vendor may quite easily in some cases work a positive injustice. For instance, suppose the owner of land knows that a proposed purchaser of land is buying it solely for using it for a particular purpose, say for building a restaurant, and also knows that it cannot be so used in consequence of there being a covenant in one of the deeds prohibiting such user, and also suppose he knows that the solicitor for the proposed purchaser has inspected the covenant, but has wrongly construed it, and, therefore, that the proposed purchaser was buying under an entirely wrong impression: If the opinion of the vendor has not been asked he would not, as the law now stands, be under any obligation to speak. This seems hardly English fair play.

It is proposed to give a general sketch of the law of mistake as regards contracts which, it is hoped, may be of service to the busy practitioner.

1. First, it is proposed to show that a mistake in a contract, to be a ground for upsetting or rectifying it, must be one materially affecting the subject matter of the thing sold and purchased.

2. Then will be considered the question whether a mistake of law, as distinguished from a mistake of fact, can be a ground for the granting of relief.

3. Afterwards will be considered the case where both the parties have been acting under a mutual mistake or misapprehension as to some vital matter affecting the subject matter thereof, that is to say:—

(a) Where the vendor meant to sell and thought he was selling one thing, and the purchaser meant to buy and thought he was buying another thing.

(b) Where the mutual mistake was that a certain state of facts existed which in fact did not exist.

(c) Where the parties agreed to put their agreement into writing, and the writing does not truly express the agreement.

4. Next will be discussed the case where the mistake is not mutual, but unilateral, that is, where the misapprehension is on the part of one only of the parties.

(a) Where the mistake is on the part of one only of the parties and has not been induced by, or contributed to, by the other party thereto.

(b) Where the mistake has been so induced by, or contributed to, by the other party.

(c) The silence of the vendor—when it will and when it will not be considered as having contributed to the making of the mistake by the other party.

5. Finally, the remedies of the parties will be considered, and particularly the very special jurisdiction or discretionary power

of the court to give relief in the case of considerable hardship, notwithstanding that the mistake may have been on the part of one of the parties alone, and not have been in any way the fault of the other party.

1. *The mistake must go to the substance of the contract.*—Whether the mistake be mutual or unilateral, it cannot be made the subject of relief unless the mistake be as to the substance of the whole thing sold, and not merely a mistake as to some minor matter connected therewith.

In *Kennedy v. Panama, &c., Co.*, 1867, L.R. 2 Q.B. 580, BLACKBURN, J., said that to authorize a rescission of the contract in the absence of fraud, the innocent misrepresentation which caused the mistake must have been such as to show "that there is a complete difference in substance between what was supposed to be and what was taken, so as to constitute a failure of consideration." In another part of his judgment he said, "The answers given by the great jurists quoted are to the effect that if there be misapprehension [that is, misapprehension caused by an innocent misrepresentation of fact by the other party] as to the substance of the thing, there is no contract; but if it be only a difference in some quality or accident, even though the misapprehension may have been the actuating motive to the purchaser, yet the contract remains binding . . . And, as we apprehend, the principle of our law is the same as that of the civil law; and the difficulty in every case is to determine whether the mistake or misapprehension is as to the substance of the whole consideration going, as it were, to the root of the matter, or only to some point, even though a material one, an error as to which does not affect the substance of the whole consideration."

The question may be asked what is meant 'exactly by the mistake being as to the substance of the thing sold or as not affecting the essential terms of the contract. Lord WATSON, in *Stewart v. Kennedy*, 1890, 15 App. Cas. 108, referring to the Scots law, which on this point is the same as the law of England, gives a clear answer. He says, "I concur as to the accuracy of the general doctrine laid down by Professor Bell (Bell's Prin., s. 11), to the effect that error in substantial, such as will invalidate consent given to a contract or obligation, must be in relation to either—(1) its subject-matter; (2) the persons undertaking, or to whom it is undertaken; (3) the price or consideration; (4) the quality of the thing engaged for, if expressly or tacitly essential; or (5) the nature of the contract or engagement supposed to be entered into." In *Re Tyrell*, 1900, 82 L.T. 675, Mr. Justice COZENS-HARDY said that if he were to say that mistake, *not being an error in the substance of what was purchased*, justified rescission, every purchaser would be applying to get his purchase set aside.

It is proposed later on to return to this subject, and discuss in detail each of the above five "substantials," after the ground has been prepared by the intermediate matter.

(To be continued.)

Reviews.

Stories of Crime.

NOTABLE BRITISH TRIALS. Burke and Hare. Edited by WILLIAM ROUGHHEAD. William Hodge & Co., Ltd. 10s. 6d.

UNSOLVED MURDER MYSTERIES. By CHARLES E. PEARCE. Stanley Paul & Co., Ltd. 16s. net.

FAMOUS CRIMES AND CRIMINALS. By C. L. McCLUER STEVENS. Stanley Paul & Co., Ltd. 12s. 6d. net.

It is a satisfaction to turn from the continuous story of crime in the Press of to-day to these books of the past, and to find that we are not so very much worse than our predecessors. In stories of murder it is a little difficult to discriminate in interest between one murder and another. In each it is murder most foul. The circumstances may vary according to the motive of the crime and the manner in which it is committed, and so it may be that the well-known series of murders for which Burke was hung, largely on the evidence of his accomplice Hare, are the most horrible in the annals of crime. Murder for the sorry gain of the sale of

the bodies for dissection reaches the lowest depths of human degradation. The whole story is told very effectively by Mr. Roughhead in the first part of this volume of "Notable British Trials," and not the least interesting parts are the chapters on the implication in the murders of Dr. Knox, who bought the bodies for his lectures, and on the immunity which, to the public indignation, Hare obtained, by turning King's evidence. The remainder of the book contains a full report of the trial. We should add that, after Dr. Knox had ignored the clamour against him for a long time, it was found necessary to have an investigation into his dealings with the murderers, and the committee by whom this task was undertaken found him guilty of no more than laxity and want of caution in the reception of the bodies. The report of the committee is printed in an Appendix, but it failed to re-establish Dr. Knox's character, and he had to exchange his career as a lecturer in the Edinburgh Medical Schools for the life of a general practitioner in Hackney, where he died in 1862. It is interesting to note that he was severely castigated by Prof. Wilson in *Neces Ambrosianæ* in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and Sir Walter Scott took an equally strong view of his culpability. The result of the matter was the passing of the Anatomy Act, 1832.

In "Unsolved Murder Mysteries" the horror is not so great because, as the title shows, one-half remains untold. It may be, as is the possible explanation of the case of Adelaide Bartlett, who was tried in 1886 for the poisoning of her husband by chloroform, that there was only accident and not murder, and the point of the story lies in the unexplained enigma. Mr. Pearce's narrative is founded to some extent on the recollections of Sir Edward Clarke, who was counsel for the defence, and gives a good many details in "The Story of my Life." Upon the verdict of not guilty being announced, he broke down under the intense strain, but Mr. Stevens makes a curious slip. "I found myself sobbing," he quotes from Sir Edward's book. "I dropped my head on the desk before me, and some twenty minutes passed before I recovered myself." "Twenty?" Surely not; a momentary collapse is intelligible; but twenty minutes is too long for probability, and on turning to the "Story," the word is absent. Nor is the rest of the passage correctly quoted. It runs: "Some minutes passed before I regained my self-control." Mr. Pearce includes Mrs. Bartlett's case in his section of "Romantic Tragedies," though whether romantic is a fitting term in such a connection we doubt. Another in the same section is the case of Mary Ashford, which led to the last wager of battle. It is, perhaps, not generally known that Thornton, who was arrested for the murder, had been already tried in the ordinary course and acquitted. Then the murdered girl's brother and heir-at-law proceeded against him for wager of battle. It was an ingenious move on the solicitor's part to raise the question again, but physically Ashford was no match for Thornton and he declined the combat. Like the Burke and Hare murders, the case led to a change in the law, and "wager of battle," which had been, of course, long obsolete, was abolished by statute. Other sections of the book are "Motiveless Murders," including the singular murder of the servant girl Jane Roberts, in Manchester, in 1879, and "Shop Murders," with John Williams, the Ratcliffe Highway murderer, who furnished De Quincey with the subject of "Murder considered as one of the Fine Arts." But why the murders of the Marrs and the Williamsons are treated as unsolved mysteries, we are not clear. John Williams was not hanged for them, it is true; but that was because he hanged himself in prison.

"Famous Crimes and Criminals" has its share of murders, but it narrates other crimes as well. Of murders the most horrible case is that of Mrs. Gunness, "known throughout the length and breadth of America as 'the Female Bluebeard.'" She had a farm in Indiana, and was well off. She advertised for husbands to share her wealth, and had a lethal chamber in which she got rid of the applicants. Her victims are said to have been not less than a hundred, and this was hardly twenty years ago. Memories are short, but we do not remember the matter and it seems too incredible to be true. There is an interesting story of "The First of the Buccaneers," a savage ruffian called Francis L'Olonnois, and there is Madame Rachel, with her "beautiful for ever" fraud, and the "Running Rein" case, a Derby winner swindle, and many other cases of swindling, or of murder and blackmail like that of Franz von Veltheim. These "famous crimes" are skilfully written up, and the book has enough excitement to fill a whole series of "best sellers," and if it sometimes seems that a career of fraud is too easy and profitable, justice triumphs in the end, and condign punishment awaits the successful criminal.

Statutory Rules and Orders.

STATUTORY RULES AND ORDERS. Other than those of a Local, Personal, or Temporary Character, issued in the year 1923. And also Appendix of Prerogative Orders; Classified List of Local Orders; Table showing effect of Legislation; and Index. Published by Authority. H.M. Stationery Office. Obtainable at London, Imperial House, Kingsway, W.C.2; 28, Abingdon

Street, S.W.1; Manchester, York Street; Cardiff, 1, St. Andrew's Crescent; Edinburgh, 120, George Street; Belfast, 15, Donegall Square West. £1 15s. net.

Over a year ago Sir Lynden Macassey, K.C., contributed to the *Journal of Comparative Legislation* a very interesting article on "Law-Making by Government Departments." It appeared in the number for February, 1923. We noticed it shortly afterwards (67 SOL. J., 431) and reproduced his quotation from a speech of Lord Cozens-Hardy, M.R., made at a City dinner, in 1911, including the passage in which he deprecated the present tendency to delegate law-making. The real legislation, Lord Cozens-Hardy said, was not to be found on the Statute Book alone. "They found certain Rules and Orders by some of the Government Departments under the authority of the Statute itself. He was one of those who regarded that as a very bad system. For administrative action generally meant something done by a man whose name they did not know, sitting at a desk in a Government office, very apt to be a despot if free from interference in a Court of Justice."

This was before the war, when delegated legislation had already become "enormous," and during the war it attained "prodigious dimensions." These are Sir Lynden Macassey's expressions, and we leave to him and the dictionaries the exact increment of "prodigious" on "enormous." But, in fact, we are far too deeply committed to delegated law-making for there to be any chance of its abolition, and all that can be done is to attempt to keep it within reasonable bounds, and secure its due publicity. The matter has been discussed more in detail by Mr. Cecil Carr in his book on Delegated Legislation, and these sources will enable the reader who is interested to follow up. "If," said Sir Lynden Macassey, "we are to be governed mainly, as really is the case to-day, by Government Departments under delegated power, then surely all legislative provisions whatsoever in the forms of rules and orders should without exception be printed, published, and circulated, as fully, expeditiously and cheaply as the public or private statutes." As to cheapness, the prices of the statutes have been greatly increased, but it should be noticed that while the S. R. & O. for 1921 were issued at £2 10s., the present volume for 1923 is issued at £1 15s., though this is probably due to the reduction in size from 1,691 pages to 1,212. And, of course, it is comparatively few persons who require the collected Orders. For ordinary use it is sufficient if particular Orders can be readily traced and obtained at reasonable prices. Probably the arrangements of the Stationery Office enable this to be done.

The present volume contains Orders ranging over a great variety of subjects, including Air Navigation, Cinematographs, Dentistry (the Regulations of the Dental Board), Rent Restriction, Peace Treaties, Probation of Offenders, and Solicitors (Examination and Striking off the Rolls), and Workmen's Compensation, and is arranged in alphabetical order according to subjects; and the excellent Index assists in the ready finding of any particular Rule or Order. The publication of the Rules and Orders is made under ss. 3 and 4 of the Rules Publication Act, 1893. The volume is a very useful companion to the annual volumes of the statutes, and is essential for a complete guide to current legislation.

Procedure at Meetings.

THE CONDUCT OF AND PROCEDURE AT PUBLIC AND COMPANY MEETINGS. By ALBERT CREW, Barrister-at-Law. Eighth Edition. Revised and Enlarged. Jordan & Son, Ltd. 5s. net.

So many persons are interested in the conduct of meetings that Mr. Crew's very clear and complete exposition of the subject has been found very useful, and this new edition will be welcomed. The first part deals with meetings other than company meetings, and the second covers the two classes of company meetings—meetings of directors and meetings of shareholders. For the due conduct of business it is necessary to be well acquainted with the provisions of the statutes and of the regulations of the company, and when difficulties arise and legal assistance has to be invoked, there are numerous judicial decisions to be considered. Mr. Crew's book supplies valuable information in both connections, and Part III contains useful suggestions as to public speaking. A series of Appendices deal with special matters, such as the definitions of terms and forms of notices, agenda, and minutes, and give the text of the Local Authorities (Admission of the Press to Meetings) Act, 1908, and the Public Meeting Act, 1908; also the practice of the Police with regard to keeping order inside public meetings.

Portraits of the following Solicitors have appeared in the *SOLICITORS' JOURNAL*: Sir A. Copson Peake, Mr. R. W. Dibdin, Mr. E. W. Williamson, Sir Chas. H. Morton and Sir Kingsley Wood. Copies of the *JOURNAL* containing such portraits may still be obtained, price 1s.

Books of the Week.

Charities.—HERBERT FRY'S Royal Guide to London and Other Charities. 60th New and Revised Edition. The Churchman Publishing Co., Ltd. 2s. net.

Income Tax.—BURN'S Income Tax Guide. Sixth Edition. covering 1924 Budget. Edinburgh: W. Green & Sons, Ltd.; London: Simpkin & Co. 2s. 6d. net.

TOLLY'S Complete Income Tax, &c.; with Irish Free State Supplement. Charles H. Tolly, 107, Tierney Road, Streatham Hill, S.W.2; Waterlow & Sons, Ltd. 3s. post free, with Supplement; or, without Supplement, 2s. 6d. (post free, 2s. 8d.). Supplement, 8d., post free.

Ministry of Health.

ANNUAL REPORT.

The Annual Report of the Ministry of Health for the year 1923-24 is now in the press and will be published to-day (Saturday).

The subjects dealt with in the Report fall under the main heads of Public Health, Local Government and Local Finance, administration of the Poor Law, and administration of the National Health Insurance Acts. A separate section is devoted to the work of the Welsh Board of Health.

The price of the Report (which contains about 180 pages, including appendices) will be 5s. (postage extra), and copies can be bought through any bookseller or directly from His Majesty's Stationery Office at the following addresses:—Imperial House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2; 28, Abingdon Street, London, S.W.1; York Street, Manchester; 1, St. Andrews Crescent, Cardiff; 120, George Street, Edinburgh.

CASE OF LAST SITTINGS.

Court of Appeal.

FARRANT v. CALEY. No. 2. 15th April.

SOLICITOR—CHARGING ORDER—SOLICITOR RETAINED TO PROSECUTE AN ACTION—COSTS—RIGHT TO CHARGE ON PROPERTY RECOVERED—“PROPERTY RECOVERED OR PRESERVED” THROUGH THE SOLICITOR'S INSTRUMENTALITY—JUDGMENT DEBT UNPAID—SOLICITORS ACT, 1890, 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, s. 28.

An unsatisfied judgment debt is a proper subject-matter of a charging order under s. 28 of the Solicitors Act, 1890, which empowers the court to charge property recovered in any suit, matter, or proceeding, with the payment of the costs.

Appeal from Judge at Chambers. In October, 1920, the appellant, Frederick William Perkins, was retained as solicitor for the plaintiff in an action against the defendant. The action was tried by Rowlatt, J., and on 30th May, 1921, judgment was entered for the plaintiff for £550 and costs. The costs were afterwards taxed and allowed at £160 7s. 11d. While the action was pending the plaintiff became indebted to moneylenders, some of whom issued bankruptcy notices against him. In July, 1922, the plaintiff was adjudicated a bankrupt, and F. S. Salaman was appointed his trustee in bankruptcy. In January, 1924, attempts were made between the trustee and the defendant to settle the action on the basis that the defendant's father should purchase the judgment debt and costs for £200. This compromise was proposed in the belief (which was mistaken) that the appellant was willing to accept ten guineas in satisfaction of his costs. The appellant repudiated that suggestion, and the trustee in bankruptcy thereupon decided to abandon the compromise as it offered no advantage to the plaintiff's creditors. In February, 1924, the appellant obtained an order in the action charging “the property recovered or preserved from the said Arthur Henry Caley,” the defendant, “by F. S. Salaman, the trustee in bankruptcy of the plaintiff, for his costs, charges and expenses of and in reference to this action.” The appellant afterwards took out a summons for leave (1) “to accept the sum of £200 offered by the defendant Caley or by Arthur Pelham Caley, his father, in full satisfaction of the moneys owing by the defendant under the judgment signed herein on 30th May, 1921, and to give a full and sufficient receipt” for that sum; and (2) “to appropriate” the said sum in discharge of the moneys owing by the plaintiff to him in respect of his costs, charges and expenses of and in reference to this action; interest on the taxed costs; costs in respect of the charging order and the costs of the application, and that the surplus (if any) be paid to the trustee in bankruptcy of the plaintiff. The Master dismissed the summons, and his decision was affirmed on appeal to Judge at Chambers,

on the ground that so long as the judgment debt remained unpaid there was nothing which could be described as property which had been “recovered or preserved” within the meaning of s. 28 of the Solicitors Act, 1890, and, therefore, there was nothing on which a charging order could be made. An appeal was brought to the Court of Appeal.

THE COURT (BANKES, WARRINGTON and SCRUTTON, L.J.J.) allowed the appeal. The question was as to the means by which the appellant was to be allowed to enforce the charging order. It had been laid down by Lord Coleridge, C.J. and Brett, J., in *Birchall v. Pugin*, L.R. 10 C.P. 397, that an unsatisfied judgment debt is the subject of a charging order. The court did not dissent from that view. The trustee in bankruptcy must, within one month, realise the judgment debt for a sum not less than £200, and out of the sum realised pay the appellant's costs, charges and expenses, failing which he must assign the debt to the plaintiff to enable him to realise it and pay his costs out of the proceeds, and hand the balance to the trustee in bankruptcy. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL: A. E. Woodgate; H. J. Wallington. SOLICITORS: F. W. Perkins; Woolfe and Woolfe.

[Reported by T. W. MORGAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

New Rules.

Supreme Court, England.

PROCEDURE.

THE PROVISIONAL RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT (PATENTS AND DESIGNS), 1924. DATED JULY 18, 1924.

We, the Rule Committee of the Supreme Court propose to make the following Rules:—

1. Order LIIIA of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883, shall be annulled, and the following Order shall be substituted therefor:—

“ORDER LIIIA.

“Procedure in Actions for Infringements of Patents and under the Patents and Designs Acts, 1907 and 1919.

“1. In this Order:—

‘The principal Act’ means the Patents and Designs Act, 1907, as amended by the Patents and Designs Act, 1919 [7 Edw. 7, c. 29 and 9 & 10 Geo. V, c. 80].

‘The Comptroller’ means the Comptroller-General of Patents Designs and Trade Marks.

‘The Court’ includes the Judge of the High Court for the time being selected by the Lord Chancellor as the Court for the purpose of hearing appeals and petitions under the principal Act.

“2. The Rules of the Supreme Court for the time being in force shall apply, so far as may be practicable (unless by the principal Act or by these Rules otherwise expressly provided), to all proceedings before the Court under the principal Act. In particular, if the Court is for the time being a Judge of the Chancery Division, the provisions of Order V, Rule 9, shall apply to all such proceedings, as being business assigned to the Court within the meaning of that Rule.

“3. In the case of petitions for extension of the term of a patent under section 18 of the principal Act, the following provisions shall apply:—

(a) A party intending to apply by petition shall give public notice by advertising three times in the ‘London Gazette’ and once at least in a London daily newspaper.

(b) If the applicant's principal place of business is situated in the United Kingdom at a distance of 15 miles or more from Charing Cross he shall also advertise once at least in some local newspaper published or circulating in the town or district where such place of business is situated. If the applicant has no such place of business, then if he carries on the manufacture of anything made under his specification in the United Kingdom at a distance of 15 miles or more from Charing Cross he shall advertise once at least in some local newspaper published or circulating in the town or district where he resides. If he has no such place of business and carries on no such manufacture in the United Kingdom, then if he resides in the United Kingdom at a distance of 50 miles or more from Charing Cross he shall advertise once at least in some newspaper published or circulating in the town or district where he resides.

(c) The applicant shall in his advertisements state the object of his petition and shall give notice of the day (which if the Court is for the time being a Judge of the Chancery Division shall be an ordinary petition day) on which he intends to apply to the Court for a day to be fixed before which the petition shall not be in the paper for hearing

(hereinafter called 'the appointed day'), which first mentioned day shall not be less than four weeks from the date of the publication of the last of the advertisements to be inserted in the 'London Gazette.' Every such advertisement shall state an address within the United Kingdom for service on the applicant of any document requiring service under this Rule. He shall also give notice that notices of objection must be lodged as hereinafter provided before such day so named in the said advertisements. A copy of such advertisement shall be forwarded by the applicant to the Comptroller at the same time as the first advertisement is sent to the 'London Gazette' and the Comptroller shall thereupon cause such advertisement to be inserted in the three following issues of the Illustrated Official Journal (Patents).

(d) The petition must be presented within one week from the publication of the last of the advertisements required to be published in the 'London Gazette' and a copy of the petition must within the same time be served on the Comptroller. Such petition shall be made returnable for the day named in the advertisements.

(e) The petition must be accompanied by an affidavit or affidavits of advertisements having been published by the petitioner according to the requirements of paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) hereof. The statements contained in such affidavit or affidavits may be disputed upon the hearing.

(f) Upon the day named in the advertisements the petition shall appear in the Court List, and the petitioner shall apply to the Court to fix the appointed day.

(g) The petitioner shall forthwith after the appointed day has been fixed give public notice of the same by advertising once at least in the 'London Gazette.'

(h) A party presenting a petition must lodge as hereinafter provided a copy thereof with two printed copies of the specification of his patent.

(i) The petitioner shall also lodge as hereinafter provided, not less than three weeks before the appointed day, two copies of the balance sheet of expenditure and receipts relating to the patent in question which accounts are to be proved on oath before the Court at the hearing. He shall also at the same time furnish two printed copies of the specification and of the said balance sheet to the Comptroller, and shall upon receiving two days' notice give the Comptroller or any person deputed by him for the purpose reasonable facilities for inspecting and taking extracts from the books of account by reference to which he proposes to verify the said balance sheet or from which the materials for making up the said balance sheet have been derived.

(j) Any person desirous of opposing the prayer of the petition shall lodge as hereinafter provided a notice that he intends so to oppose and giving an address in the United Kingdom for service of any document requiring service under this Rule. Such person shall at the same time serve upon the petitioner a copy of such notice. Such notices shall be respectively lodged and served before the day named in the petitioner's advertisements as that on which he intends to apply to the Court for the appointed day to be fixed.

(k) The petitioner shall forthwith upon receipt of such notice serve a copy of his petition upon each person giving such notice.

(l) Every person giving such notice as aforesaid shall within three weeks after service of the petition upon him lodge as hereinafter provided two copies and serve upon the petitioner one copy and lodge with the Comptroller three copies in writing of particulars of the objections upon which he intends to rely against the granting of the prayer of the petition.

(m) Any person who shall not within the said three weeks lodge and serve such particulars of objections as aforesaid shall be deemed to have abandoned his opposition.

(n) No person who has delivered such particulars of objections shall be entitled to oppose the granting of the prayer of the petition on any grounds not stated in such particulars.

(o) Any person who has lodged notice that he intends to oppose the granting of the prayer of the petition shall be entitled to be heard on the application to fix the appointed day, and every person who has lodged and served particulars of objection shall be served by the petitioner with notice of the appointed day.

(p) The petition shall not be entered in the list for trial until the expiration of the time limited for the lodging and service of the particulars of objections and shall only be entered for trial on the lodging of an affidavit on behalf of the petitioner that all persons who have served him with notice of intention to oppose the prayer of his petition have been served with copies of the petition. The petition

shall, if and so long as the Court is a Judge of the Chancery Division and subject to any direction of the Court to the contrary be set down in the same manner as if it had been a witness action assigned to that Judge and shall be marked in the witness list not before the day of

19 'being the appointed day.'

(q) Any persons who have delivered particulars of objections shall be entitled, at their own expense, to obtain from the petitioner copies of the accounts which have been lodged by him.

(r) All petitions, documents, and copies by this Rule required to be lodged shall if and so long as the Court is a Judge of the Chancery Division be lodged at the Chambers of the Judge, and subject as aforesaid shall be lodged with such person and at such place as the Court may from time to time direct.

(s) The Court may excuse petitioners and opponents from compliance with any of the requirements of this Rule and may give such directions in matters of procedure and practice as it shall consider to be just and expedient.

(t) The Comptroller if he elects or is directed to appear on the question of granting the prayer of any petition shall not be required to give notice of the grounds of any objection he may think fit to take or of any evidence which he may think fit to place before the Court.

(u) The Court may in cases where opposition has been entered to the prayer of a petition give costs to or against such opponents.

(v) In the event of the Court refusing the prayer of the petition the Court shall not except under special circumstances give more than one set of costs amongst all the opponents.

(w) The Comptroller shall not be entitled to any costs on or in relation to his appearance on or opposition to the granting of the prayer of a petition.

(z) Service of any document requiring service under this Rule may be made by enclosing such document in a prepaid registered letter and posting such letter to the person required to be served at his address for service.

(To be continued.)

County Court Rules.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (No. 2) RULES, 1924.
DATED AUGUST 1, 1924.

1. In these Rules—

"the existing Rules" means the Consolidated Workmen's Compensation Rules, July, 1913, as amended (a); and
"the 1923 Act" means the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923. (b)

2. In Rule 47 of the existing Rules—

(a) the words "(other than the society or committee)" shall be omitted;

(b) after the words "if the society or committee objects," there shall be inserted the words "on any other ground";

(c) after the words "stating the grounds on which," the words "he disputes the genuineness of the memorandum or on which the society or committee or employer objects to its being recorded" shall be omitted, and the following words shall be substituted therefor: "the genuineness of the memorandum is disputed or the recording thereof is objected to."

3. Rule 48 of the existing Rules shall be annulled and the following Rule shall be substituted therefor:—

"48. *Notice of dispute or objection.*—On receipt of any such notice as in the last preceding Rule mentioned, being either a notice disputing the genuineness of the memorandum by any party interested or a notice by the employer objecting to the memorandum being recorded on the ground specified in paragraph (c) of that Rule, the registrar shall send a copy thereof to each of the other parties interested, together with a notice according to the form in the Appendix [Form 40], informing such party that the memorandum will not be recorded except with the consent in writing of the party disputing the genuineness thereof or of the employer objecting to the same being recorded or by order of the Judge."

4. In Rule 49A of the existing Rules—

(a) after the words "genuineness of the memorandum" there shall be inserted the words "nor any notice by the employer objecting to the memorandum being recorded on the ground specified in paragraph (c) of that Rule"; and

(b) the words "(other than the employer)" shall be omitted.

5. In Forms 39 and 40 in the Appendix to the existing Rules the following words shall be omitted:—

"Note.—Where the approved society or committee objects under section 12 (4) of the 1923 Act to the registration of an agreement, this form may be used with the necessary modifications":

and Rule 12 of the Workmen's Compensation (No. 1) Rules, 1924 (S.R. & O. 1924, No. 167) shall accordingly be annulled.

6. These Rules may be cited as the Workmen's Compensation Rules (No. 2), 1924, and the existing Rules shall have effect as further amended by these Rules.

We hereby submit these Rules to the Lord Chancellor.

E. Bray.

T. C. Granger.

W. M. Cann.

J. W. McCarthy.

Arthur L. Lowe.

A. H. Coley.

I allow these Rules, which shall come into force on the 1st day of October, 1924.

Dated the 1st day of August, 1924.

Haldane, C.

(a) S.R. & O., 1913, No. 661, as amended by 1913, No. 1400; 1914, No. 1120; 1915, No. 1133; 1917, No. 497; 1918, No. 246; 1920, No. 394; 1921, No. 1745; 1923, No. 1522; and 1924, No. 167. (b) 13 & 4 G. 5, c. 42.

Societies.

The Law Society.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

(Continued from p. 889.)

Land Transfer Act, 1897.—It was recorded in the last Annual Report that the Committee under Section 22 of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, had been set up, under the Chairmanship of Mr., now Lord, Justice Sargant, and that the late Sir Walter Trower had been appointed a member of it. It is believed that the Committee held preliminary meetings, but no new rules have been issued pending the introduction of consolidating legislation.

Sales subject to Apportioned Rents.—Members are aware that it is the practice in certain parts of the Kingdom and particularly in Lancashire in developing land for building purposes to grant conveyances subject to a perpetual rent charge, or long leases at a ground rent. The mutual enforcement of the liabilities arising from an apportionment between a vendor and purchaser of a rent charge or ground rent, and the mutual enforcement of the covenants and conditions to which the entire premises are subject, involve lengthy and complicated covenants in conveyances and assignments. The Council have been considering, in conjunction with the Manchester Law Society, whether having regard to the increasing number of sales for a small money consideration of single houses and shops subject with adjoining premises to a rent charge or ground rent, it would not be possible in order to reduce the length and complexity of such conveyances and assignments that suitable statutory covenants and indemnities should be implied. It is thought that such provisions might be conveniently introduced into one of the Bills in contemplation for consolidating and amending the Law of Property Act, 1922. The Council have been in consultation with Sir Benjamin Cherry on the subject.

Landed Property Practitioners' (Registration) Bill.—This Bill was referred to in the last Annual Report and it was stated that the Council had expressed the opinion that the Bill was unnecessary and undesirable in the public interests. The Bill, among the objects of which was to provide for the establishment of a register of all persons holding themselves out as capable of undertaking the valuation, sale, purchase, letting, taking on lease of land or building, or negotiating the same, was not proceeded with in the last session of Parliament. Its promoters inquired of the Council as to the reasons for their objection to the Bill, and the inquiry was replied to by forwarding a copy of the Report on the subject, which was included in the last Annual Report. The Council were informed that the Scottish Legal Societies were also opposing the Bill. The promoters expressed regret at the Council's opposition, and stated that they would appreciate an opportunity of discussing it. The Council at first replied that as their objections were directed to the fundamental principles of the Bill they did not consider that any useful purpose could be served by a discussion. Subsequently the promoters forwarded to the Council the draft of certain revisions and again invited the discussion upon the Bill as revised. The revisions did not seem to the Council to vary the main principles of the Bill, but they felt that courtesy demanded compliance with the promoters' repeated request. The promoters therefore were invited to and did attend at the Council Chamber. A long discussion ensued, with the result that those representing the Council retained their original opinion that the Bill was not required in the public interests.

Criminal Justice Bill.—This is a Government Bill and was introduced in 1923, but not passed. Certain recommendations

with regard to it were made by the Council as indicated in the last Annual Report. The Bill has been reintroduced by the present Government, and some of the suggestions which the Council made are included in the new Bill. The Council have drawn the attention of the Lord Chancellor to their other recommendations and have been promised that these shall receive careful consideration. The Bill has passed the House of Lords and is now awaiting second reading in the House of Commons.

Poor Persons' Procedure.—In the last Annual Report it was stated that a report which had been made on this subject by the Council and had been adopted by the Society at a Special General Meeting called for the purpose on the 27th April, 1923, had been forwarded to the Lord Chancellor with the request that he would give its recommendations sympathetic consideration. The report particularly recommended as a means of overcoming the congestion of Poor Persons' Divorce Cases, and increasing the number of solicitors who would be willing to undertake them, that jurisdiction in divorce cases should be given to the County Court. From time to time subsequently the Council were informed that it was becoming increasingly difficult to place poor persons' cases for conduct in London, and ultimately they heard from the Lord Chancellor that he proposed to appoint a Committee to go into the whole subject. In July, 1923, the then Lord Chancellor appointed a Committee to inquire into the difficulties which had arisen in the working of the Poor Persons' Rules, and to consider and report to him as to the steps which should be taken whether by way of amendment of those Rules or by the substitution of a different system with a view to assisting poor persons to pursue their civil remedies in the High Court or to defend actions brought against them. The Committee was appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Justice Lawrence, and the Council were represented upon it by Mr. Coley and Mr. Roger Gregory. The long vacation and subsequent change of Government postponed the deliberations of the Committee and rendered its reconstitution necessary. Evidence on behalf of the Council as expressed in their Report has been submitted to the Committee.

On the 18th January last a conference took place between representatives of the Council and of the Magistrates' Association regarding the assistance of poor persons in criminal cases. The Magistrates' Association stated that in the police court, poor persons by reason of their incapacity and poverty were sometimes sent to prison without having the facts of their defence properly brought before the Court. The Association suggested that the Court Probation Officer should be authorised to inspect the charge sheets and select such cases as he considered deserved help, and that these cases should be referred to a small panel of solicitors attached to the Court. It was suggested also that in suitable cases the benefit of the scheme should extend to the plaintiff as well as a defendant, that the cases would not be numerous, and that the burden on solicitors who might be willing to undertake the work would not be heavy. The Council expressed no opinion upon the scheme, but suggested that possibly the provisions of the Poor Prisoners Defence Act might be extended to Police Courts.

Irish Free State Solicitors. Suggested Concessions on Admission in England.—In the last Annual Report a reference was made to this subject, which showed that the Irish Free State, having passed legislation which would permit English and Scottish solicitors to practise in the Free State on their English and Scottish qualifications, were anxious that England and Scotland would reciprocate by allowing Irish Free State solicitors to practise in England and Scotland merely on their Free State qualifications. The Council had formed the opinion that just as it would be dangerous for English and Scottish solicitors to take advantage of the legislation which had been passed by the Irish Free State, so it would be equally dangerous, not merely for the public, but also for Irish solicitors themselves, if they were permitted to practice in England or in Scotland without properly qualifying themselves to do so. The Council had informed the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland that while they would not raise objection to a waiver of service under articles by Irish Solicitors, they would contend that no Order should be made under the Colonial Solicitors Act, 1900, in favour of the Irish Free State unless it included a provision that Free State Solicitors should pass the Law Society's Trust Accounts and Book-keeping, and Final Examinations.

The Council have not heard that the Irish Free State has applied for an Order under the Colonial Solicitors Act. They are, indeed, of opinion that for the moment the Irish Free State are not in a position to make such an application. Section 2 of the Irish Free State Constitution Act, 1922, does not provide unconditionally that the Colonial Solicitors Act may be applied to the Irish Free State, it merely provides that the Act may be so applied if the Parliament of the Irish Free State make provision to that effect. So far as the Council are aware, no such provision has been made by the Parliament of the Irish Free State.

Divorce Division. Arrears in Interlocutory Business.—The arrears in interlocutory business which were commented upon

in last year's Report. The President observed that the arrears in the Treasury, of the Reg. expected, arrears. that Divor. Central Off. grounds at last Annual the sugges arrears mi arranging Royal Cou Council ha They belie fession as who find their appo those in C have again have receiv with the R Matrimo monial jur Society po jurisdiction a request repeated si that the C had not b been awai on Poor wider exte Rent and Interest R by the Go facilitate t who had on behalf provision. observed t

HOLIDAY CRUISES TO THE MEDITERRANEAN

R.M.S.P. "ARCADIAN"

from Southampton,
SEPTEMBER 20th,
OCTOBER 17th.
NOVEMBER 15th.

R.M.S.P. "ARAGUAYA"

from Southampton,
SEPTEMBER 27th.

WRITE FOR FULL PARTICULARS:

THE ROYAL MAIL LINE

LONDON: ATLANTIC HOUSE, MOORGATE, E.C.2; AMERICA HOUSE, COCKSPUR STREET, S.W.

or Local Representative

in last year's Annual Report have again been complained of. The President of the Division stated in reply that he had had close observation kept upon cases of complaint and was glad to be able to inform the Council that, with the sanction of the Treasury, an Assistant Registrar, well experienced in the work of the Registry, had entered upon his duties, and the President expected, and was assured, that this assistance would dispose of arrears. He stated with regard to a suggestion by the Council that Divorce Registry Taxations should be transferred to the Central Office, that it had been reserved for settlement upon broad grounds at a suitable date. It will be remembered that in the last Annual Report it was stated that the Council had made the suggestion that one method by which these interlocutory arrears might be dealt with and avoided in future would be by arranging that summonses generally should be heard at the Royal Courts of Justice instead of at Somerset House. The Council had hoped that this proposal would be adopted at once. They believed that it would be found acceptable to the profession as tending very materially to the convenience of those who find it necessary and very difficult on occasions to fit in their appointments on summonses at Somerset House with those in Chancery and King's Bench Chambers. The Council have again reminded Sir Henry Duke of the suggestion and have received a reply from him stating that it is under discussion with the Registrars.

Matrimonial Causes. Trial at Assizes.—Soon after matrimonial jurisdiction had been given to Assizes, the Bristol Law Society pointed out that Bristol had been omitted from the jurisdiction and asked the Council to urge its inclusion. Such a request accordingly was made to the Lord Chancellor and was repeated shortly before Christmas. The Lord Chancellor replied that the question of extending Divorce jurisdiction to Bristol had not been dealt with because the new Divorce Rules had been awaited and because Mr. Justice Lawrence's Committee on Poor Persons Procedure, which might possibly propose a wider extension, had not reported.

Rent and Mortgage Interest Restriction.—The Rent and Mortgage Interest Restrictions Bill of last year, which was introduced by the Government of the day, contained a clause which would facilitate the calling in of Trust Estate Mortgages. Witnesses who had given evidence before the Departmental Committee on behalf of the Council had urged the inclusion of some such provision. It was with great regret, therefore, that the Council observed that the clause referred to, which empowered County

Court Judges to direct the calling in of mortgages securing money required for the purposes of winding-up the estates of deceased persons, had been deleted from the Bill. The Council took what steps were possible to urge the restoration of the clause. Their efforts, however, were unsuccessful. They are still of opinion that the clause was a desirable one and that any legislation which is introduced should include such a provision.

Probate and Divorce Court Procedure.—There was included in the Appendix to the last Annual Report, a Report of the Legal Procedure Committee, urging that the Probate and Divorce Court Rules should be simplified and brought up to date. The Report included a recommendation that the Divorce Court Practice should be assimilated to that of the King's Bench Division, and the Probate Court Practice in contentious matters assimilated to that of the Chancery Division. Copies of the Report were sent to the Lord Chancellor and to the President of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division. The Lord Chancellor replied that he was in communication with the President of the Probate Division on the subject, and the President acted with considerable promptitude by proceeding himself to prepare a complete revision of the Rules. His lordship was good enough to consult members of the Council during his consideration of the matter, and ultimately, when the draft rules had been completed, to submit them to the Council for their consideration. The Council, in their reply, expressed their appreciation of the consideration which the President had given to the suggestions submitted to him, but expressed regret that he had found himself unable to carry out in a fuller degree the proposals the Council had made, which it was understood was due to the provisions of the Matrimonial Causes Acts, and hoped an early opportunity would be taken of obtaining the legislation necessary to render the assimilation of the practice of the two Divisions possible.

Consolidation of the Judicature Acts.—The Council welcomed the introduction of the Judicature Consolidation Bill, which is a measure whose introduction they have been urging for a very long period. They observe that the Bill includes certain amendments with regard to Probate practice, which were included in the Law of Property Act, 1922, and that the Consolidating Bill is intended to come into force on the 1st January, 1926.

Trust Holdings in Railway Companies.—It is the practice of Railway Companies in forwarding dividend warrants on trust holdings to insert in the warrant the name only of the first trustee or to add merely the words "and others." The Bank of England puts on its warrants, in addition to the name of the first trustee,

the name or initials of the others, and this practice has resulted in great convenience to trustees and their bankers and solicitors. The Council have consulted with the Institute of British Bankers and the Chartered Institute of Secretaries, and have decided with those bodies to ask the Railway Companies to follow the practice of the Bank of England.

Government Solicitorships.—It will be remembered that in the year 1920, soon after two members of the Bar had been appointed respectively Solicitor and Assistant Solicitor to the Ministry of Labour, the Council addressed to the Lord Chancellor a letter protesting against the appointment of barristers as Government solicitors, and asking his lordship to protect the interests of solicitors in the matter. The Lord Chancellor replied that he felt considerable sympathy with the views which the Council had expressed and he stated that if the intention was that a department should have in their exclusive employment a gentleman whose name could appear on the records and who could in other respects perform the functions of a solicitor of the Supreme Court, the office should be conferred upon a solicitor. He stated that he was disposed to deprecate the further extension of the principle of appointing barristers and that he had not been consulted with regard to the appointments particularly complained of.

In October last a vacancy arose in the Office of Solicitor to the Treasury, and before any public announcement of the vacancy had been made it was filled by the appointment of a barrister who up to that time had been holding the Office of Solicitor to the Ministry of Labour. This announcement was accompanied by the additional statement that the consequent vacancy at the Ministry of Labour had been filled by the appointment of a barrister who up to that time had been occupying the position of Assistant Solicitor to the same Ministry. No greater infringement of the principle for which the Council had been contending could have been perpetrated, and their dissatisfaction was increased by the circumstance that they had had no previous notice of the vacancies. The Council did not wish to challenge the personal qualification of the particular gentlemen concerned, and in the correspondence which ensued they were careful to make this clear. They did, however, address to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Labour letters of protest that the solicitors' branch of the profession had been completely disregarded. Replies were received from the two Departments concerned seeking to justify that disregard, but in the opinion of the Council quite ineffectually. The Council forwarded a copy of the correspondence both to Lord Cave and to Lord Haldane. They were glad to receive their concurrence in the views which had been expressed by the Earl of Birkenhead, and from Lord Haldane a promise that when opportunity permitted he would raise the matter in conversation with his colleagues.

Proceedings By and Against the Crown.—The Council have for a considerable time past been urging the complete revision of Crown proceedings, so as to secure as far as possible, and with due regard to the secrecy of State documents, that such proceedings shall be assimilated to proceedings as between Subject and Subject. A Departmental Committee was appointed to consider the whole matter, and it is believed that their deliberations proceeded so far as the preparation of a Bill which would have gone far to meet the views which the Council had expressed. For some undisclosed reason, however, no effective action has been taken. In December last the Council passed a resolution that the reform of the practice and procedure in actions by and against the Crown which the Council have from time to time submitted to the Lord Chancellor, should be postponed no longer. They concurred with the view of the business and commercial community that the Subject should be entitled to the same rights and remedies against the Crown as he has against his fellow Subject, and that the same rules and regulations as far as possible should apply in all legal proceedings whether as between Crown and Subject or between Subject and Subject. The present archaic system appeared to the Council to create injustice in many cases, and the changes suggested would save time and money to the Crown and its servants, as well as to the public. A copy of the resolution was sent to the Lord Chancellor, who was urged to introduce a Bill into Parliament. In his reply Lord Cave stated that it did not appear to him that he could himself introduce a Bill upon the subject whilst the deliberations of the Committee presided over by the Lord Chief Justice were still proceeding, but that a copy of the Council's representations had been forwarded to the Lord Chief Justice, the Master of the Rolls, and the Attorney-General, urging that the matter should be proceeded with.

Debenture Holders' Actions. Fee on Master's Certificate.—The attention of the Council was directed to the fact that under the High Court Fees Order, a heavy Court Fee may be payable on the Master's Certificate in a Debenture Holder's Action, and that frequently that fee has to be found by the plaintiff's solicitor out of his own pocket. The Council addressed a letter to the Lord Chancellor directing attention to the hardship and suggesting that the Order should be revised so as to provide that the fee should be payable out of the proceeds of the sale of the property

upon which the Debenture issue had been secured. The Lord Chancellor replied that the Order was at present under consideration and that the suggestion which the Council had made would receive consideration in connection with any revision of the Order which might be deemed necessary. The Council understand that the new Fees Order will contain a provision that the fee in question is to be made at such time as the Court or a Judge may direct.

Lunacy Taxing Office.—Representations were made to the Council that considerable delays were taking place in the Lunacy Taxing Office and a letter was addressed to the Lord Chancellor's secretary on the subject. He replied stating that the matter had been engaging the attention of the Master in Lunacy and himself for some time and that steps had been taken to deal with it. He would be glad to be informed if there were still grounds for complaint.

Bradford Chamber of Commerce.—The Bradford Law Society inquired from the Council whether they should comply with a request which had been made to them by the Bradford Chamber of Commerce that they would co-operate in forming a Legal Section of the Chamber of Commerce. The Council replied that no professional objection to the suggestion appeared to exist. A copy of the Report which was adopted on the subject is included in the Appendix.

Divorce Practice in Egypt.—It was pointed out by a Practitioner in Egypt that when a request is made by the Divorce Court in England to the Consular Court in Egypt to take evidence in Egypt for use in the English Court, the Foreign Office, before transmitting the request to the Consular Court, require that the Pleadings and other papers shall be translated into French. It was pointed out to the Council that this was an unnecessary expense for the reason that the Consular Court is presided over by English Judges, who deal with the whole business in English, and entirely disregard the French translations. A communication was addressed to the Foreign Office on the subject, who in turn consulted the acting British High Commissioner at Cairo. That official confirmed the statement that the translations served no useful purpose. The Foreign Office accordingly offered to make a communication to the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division suggesting that the translations should no longer be made. The Council thanked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for his attention to the matter and requested him to make the representations accordingly. Such communication was made to the Senior Registrar, and the Council understand that the practice of requiring the translations has been discontinued.

Carbon Copies of Draft Documents.—The Council desire to direct the attention of solicitors to the subjoined Resolution, which they passed at their Meeting on the 11th April, and they venture to hope that the practice thereby recommended, of enclosing carbon copies with draft documents sent for perusal, may be adopted by the profession as a general practice:—

"That the practice adopted in many districts when sending a typed draft for perusal by a solicitor, of sending also without charge a carbon copy for his use, be approved and recommended as a convenient practice, and one which should be generally adopted when practicable."

Commission to Solicitors on Government Issues.—In the Annual Report for 1922 reference was made to the question of the Treasury allowing to Solicitors a commission upon subscriptions to Government Loans made by clients to their Solicitors in the same way as such allowance is made to bankers, stockbrokers and financial houses. It was then stated that a joint memorial had been addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer by this Society and four of the Scottish Law Societies with a letter requesting him to receive a joint deputation on the subject. A reply was shortly afterwards received from the Treasury that the Lord Commissioners were unable to depart from the view that they could not properly extend the range of commission payments in respect of Government Loans, and that in the circumstances no useful purpose would be served by the proposed deputation.

The question has been raised again by a recent resolution of the Associated Provincial Law Societies, and the Council have decided to make further representations to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the subject.

Proceedings under the Solicitors Acts.—The thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Committee constituted under the Solicitors Acts, 1888 and 1919, will be found at p. 75, and a reference to this Report will show that on the application of the Society the names of four solicitors, who had previously been convicted on indictment and sentenced to terms of imprisonment, were struck off the Roll by order of the Committee; that on the application of private individuals the name of one solicitor was struck off the Roll and four others were suspended from practising and ordered to pay costs; that eight solicitors, where the Committee found that reasons existed to justify the applications, were ordered to pay the costs; that in one case the complainant was ordered to pay the costs; and that in one case the Committee made no order as to costs. / Convictions for offences under Section 12 of the Solicitors

The Lord
under con-
had made
revision of
the Council
provision that
Court or a

ade to the
the Lunacy
Chancellor's
the matter
Lunacy and
to deal with
will grounds

aw Society
ply with a
d Chamber
g a Legal
plied that
l to exist.
is included

practitioner
e Court in
vidence in
ice, before
that the
rench. It
necessary
sided over
n English,
mmunica-
ct, who in
at Cairo.
anslations
accordingly
orce and
s should
y of State
requested
mmunica-
understand
been dis-

desire to
resolution,
and they
ended, of
perusal,
n sending
ling also
oved and
ch should

e Annual
n of the
criptions
rs in the
rkers and
orial had
by this
a letter
ject. A
that the
ew that
ayments
ances no
on.
ution of
cil have
or of the

Annual
rs Acts,
to this
e names
ictment
he Roll
private
roll and
to pay
and that
pay the
er as to
olicitors

Act, 1874, and Section 44 of the Stamp Act, 1891, were obtained against twenty unqualified persons, and other cases have either been dismissed or withdrawn after inquiry and apology being given. Under the provisions of the Solicitors Act, 1906, the Council refused the application of one undischarged bankrupt for the renewal of his practising certificate. As regards applications under Section 16 of the Solicitors Act, 1888, the Council refused to renew the certificates of four solicitors on the ground of bankruptcy or other circumstances, and in three other cases, where applicants admitted having practised without being duly qualified, the certificate was issued on payment of the arrears of Duty and in some cases a fine.

Stock Exchange Prices of certain Trustee Securities.

Bank Rate 4%. Next London Stock Exchange Settlement, Thursday, 28th August.

	MIDDLE PRICE. 20th Aug.	INTEREST YIELD.
English Government Securities.		
Consols 2½%	57½	4 7 0
War Loan 5% 1920-47	101½	4 18 6
War Loan 4½% 1925-45	97½	4 12 0
War Loan 4% (Tax free) 1920-42	102½	3 18 0
War Loan 3½% 1st March 1928	96	3 12 6
Victory 4% Bonds (available at par for Estate Duty)	93½	4 5 6
Funding 4% Loan 1900-00	89½	4 9 6
Conversion Loan 3½% 1961 or after	78½	4 9 6
Local Loans 3% 1921 or after	86½	4 10 6
India 5½% 15th January 1932	100½	5 9 0
India 4½% 1950-55	86½	5 4 0
India 3½%	86½	5 5 0
India 3%	56½	5 6 0
Colonial Securities.		
British E. Africa 6% 1946-56	111xd	5 8 0
South Africa 4% 1943-63	87½xd	4 11 0
Jamaica 4½% 1941-71	95	4 14 0
New South Wales 4½% 1935-45	95½	4 14 6
W. Australia 4½% 1935-65	95	4 14 6
S. Australia 3½% 1926-36	85	4 2 0
New Zealand 4½% 1944	95½	4 14 6
New Zealand 4% 1929	96	4 3 0
Canada 3% 1938	83	3 12 6
Cape of Good Hope 3½% 1929-49	80	4 7 6
Corporation Stocks.		
Ldn. Cty. 2½% Con. Stk. after 1920 at option of Corpn.	54	4 12 6
Ldn. Cty. 3% Con. Stk. after 1920 at option of Corpn.	65	4 12 6
Birmingham 3% on or after 1947 at option of Corpn.	65	4 12 6
Bristol 3½% 1925-65	76	4 12 0
Cardiff 3½% 1935	88	3 19 6
Glasgow 2½% 1925-40	75	3 6 6
Liverpool 3½% on or after 1942 at option of Corpn.	77	4 11 0
Manchester 3% on or after 1941	65	4 12 6
Newcastle 3½% irredeemable	75½	4 13 0
Nottingham 3% irredeemable	64½	4 13 0
Plymouth 3% 1920-60	69½	4 6 0
Middlesex C.C. 3½% 1927-47	82	4 5 6
English Railway Prior Charges.		
Gt. Western Rly. 4% Debenture	84½	4 14 6
Gt. Western Rly. 5% Rent Charge	103½xd	4 16 6
Gt. Western Rly. 5% Preference	101xd	4 19 0
L. North Eastern Rly. 4% Debenture	83	4 16 0
L. North Eastern Rly. 4% Guaranteed	81½xd	4 18 0
L. North Eastern Rly. 4% 1st Preference	81xd	4 19 0
L. Mid. & Scot. Rly. 4% Debenture	83½	4 16 0
L. Mid. & Scot. Rly. 4% Guaranteed	81½xd	4 18 0
L. Mid. & Scot. Rly. 4% Preference	81xd	4 19 0
Southern Railway 4% Debenture	83	4 16 0
Southern Railway 5% Guaranteed	101xd	4 19 0
Southern Railway 5% Preference	99½xd	5 0 6

A Corporate Trustee together with the Family Solicitor

As Adviser assures Efficient Management, Experience and Continuity.

THE ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE

(Incorporated A.D. 1720) acts as

EXECUTOR AND TRUSTEE OF WILLS or TRUSTEE OF SETTLEMENTS.

Trust Funds are kept apart from the Corporation's Funds.

THE SOLICITOR NOMINATED BY THE TESTATOR IS EMPLOYED.

For full particulars apply to the Secretary—

HEAD OFFICE: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.3.
LAW COURTS BRANCH: 29-30, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1.

Legal News.

Information Required.

WILLIAM WILSON, once of Bury House, Scarisbrick, Lancashire, believed to have died in Australia many years ago.—Will any person having knowledge of any Will left by this deceased, or particulars of the estate left by him, please communicate with Wilson, 44, Sleepers-hill, Anfield, Liverpool.

Appointments.

Mr. THOMAS SCANLAN has been appointed to be a Metropolitan Police Magistrate, to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Cecil Chapman. Mr. Scanlan, who was called to the Bar by Gray's Inn in 1912, was member of Parliament for North Sligo from 1909 to 1918.

Mr. Shinwell, Secretary for Mines, has appointed Judge J. W. MCCARTHY to be chairman of the West Yorkshire Joint District Board, in the place of Mr. R. H. Amphlett, K.C., who has resigned.

General.

A new form of charter for the carriage of pitwood from France to Bristol Channel ports has been agreed between the Documentary Committee of the Chamber of Shipping and the Cardiff and Bristol Channel Pitwood Importers' Association. The new document is to come into operation on 15th September next, and copies can be obtained from the usual printers.

From *The Times* of 18th August, 1924:—

COURT OF CHANCERY.—At the sitting of the Court this morning an Arab servant presented himself, with a letter in his hand addressed to "John Lord Eldon, Lord High Chancellor of England." The letter, it appeared, was from Samid Khan, a nabob resident in Calcutta, and it regarded, it was understood, some landed property in the East Indies, now under litigation in Chancery. The Arabian messenger was furnished with the address of the Lord Chancellor, and was directed to leave the letter at his lordship's house. The Arab soon after made his *salam* and retired.

At Woolwich Police Court on the 14th inst. Mr. Herbert Vaughan, solicitor, applied for a summons calling on a landlord to show cause why an order giving him possession of rooms should not be varied or revoked. Mr. Vaughan explained that his application was based on s. 2 of the Prevention of Eviction Act, which became law last month. Mr. Ratcliffe Cousins (after a prolonged study of the Act) said: This is another example of legislation by reference, the worst and most slovenly kind of legislation. You are referred to this Act and to that, and while it gives occupation to the Bench and solicitors, it also provides continual fun and amusement in working out the puzzles it contains.

VALUATIONS FOR INSURANCE.—It is very essential that all Policy Holders should have a detailed valuation of their effects. Property is generally very inadequately insured, and in case of loss insurers suffer accordingly. **DERENHAM STONE & SONS (LIMITED)**, 26, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2, the well-known chattel valuers and auctioneers (established over 100 years), have a staff of expert valuers, and will be glad to advise those desiring valuations for any purpose. Jewels, plate, furs, furniture, works of art, bric-a-brac a speciality. [ADVT.]

THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL.

WHEN CALLED UPON TO ADVISE AS TO LEGACIES, PLEASE DO NOT FORGET THE CLAIMS OF THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL, WHICH IS URGENTLY IN NEED OF FUNDS FOR ITS HUMANE WORK.

Winding-up Notices.

**JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.
CREDITORS MUST SEND IN THEIR CLAIMS TO THE
LIQUIDATOR AS NAMED ON OR BEFORE
THE DATE MENTIONED.**

London Gazette.—FRIDAY August 15.
F. NORMINGTON LTD. Sept. 15. Edward B. Pinckney, 21, Spring-gdns., Manchester.
H. J. WEBB & CO. (SMITHFIELD, LONDON) LTD. Sept. 15. William H. Cork, 19, Eastcheap.
HARROLD & CO. LTD. Sept. 17. Francis E. Whitehead, 133, Moorgate, E.C.2.
London Gazette.—TUESDAY, August 19.
CHAMBERS & HAMMOND LTD. Sept. 18. Thomas Paton, 3, Piccadilly, Bradford.
BOCKENBROUHT ESTATES CO. LTD. Sept. 15. James Leslie Sweet, 2, Bedford-row.
C. MARTIN LTD. Sept. 30. Alfred I. C. Forster, 2, Stonegate, York.
THOMPSON & CLEMENTE LTD. Sept. 19. George K. Cook, Godstall-chmbrs., Chester.
RAMSDEN & HARRISON LTD. Sept. 1. H. F. White, 98, Albion-st., Leeds.
THORN, FOXTAINE & CO. LTD. Sept. 6. William A. S. Oxforrow, 19-20, Temple-chmbrs., E.C.
H. ROSSNER & CO. LTD. Sept. 15. George B. Nancarrow, Royal Exchange, Middlesbrough.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, August 15.
The Doncaster Estates Co. Ltd. James Kane Ltd.
Hall Gate Chambers Ltd. International Cowboy Con-
C. Martin Ltd. tests Ltd.
Frank Hopper & Son's Ltd. Colebrook Hurt Ltd.
John Thornwell & Son Ltd. Morton, Carry & Campbell
Nevitts Ltd. Ltd.
Joseph Guy Ltd. F. H. Pepper & Co. Ltd.
G. H. Allin & Co. Ltd. Syddie Ltd.
Pockett's Bristol Channel Remy Ltd.
Steam Packet Co. Ltd. Alpine Slide Co. (Southport)
Vauxhall City Tonnages and Ltd.
Land Development Co. Ltd. Potter-Irwin & Smith Ltd.

Bankruptcy Notices.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, August 15.
ALLEN, JOHN W., Peterborough, Baker. Peterborough. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
ASHWORTH, DAVID, Simpson Cough, Laeca, Farmer. Bolton. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
AUGUSTUS, HENRY, Middlesbrough, Steelworker. Middlesbrough. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
AYTON, MERVYN, Nisfield, Sussex. Hastings. Pet. July 25. Ord. Aug. 13.
BAXTER, HAROLD K., Bradford, Wholesale Baker. Bradford. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
BETH, JOSEPH C., St. Cleithorpes, Fish Merchant. Great Grimsby. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 13.
BOSHER, JOHN A., Aberdeen, Electrical Engineer. Aberdeen. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
B. W. Brown and Son, Leicester, Builders. Leicester. Pet. July 19. Ord. Aug. 11.
BRUCE, SIR MICHAEL W. S., Bart., Chelsea. High Court. Pet. June 5. Ord. Aug. 11.
BROWN, GEORGE W. A., Lough, Solicitor. Great Grimsby. Pet. June 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
CHARTERS, ERNEST, Liverpool, Laundry Proprietor. Liverpool. Pet. July 31. Ord. Aug. 13.
CLATTON, ERNEST, Keighley, Landryman. Bradford. Pet. Aug. 18. Ord. Aug. 13.
COLLINS, EMILY, Scarborough, Ladies' Outfitter. Scarborough. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
COOPER, GEORGE S., York-Ridge, Adelphi, Accountant. High Court. Pet. Aug. 21. Ord. Aug. 11.
COX, LEVIN T., Norwich, Market Salesman. Norwich. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
EARDHAM, ELIZABETH, Huddersfield, Fish Dealer. Huddersfield. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
EVANS, WILLIAM, Houslow, Market Gardener. Brentford. Pet. Aug. 8. Ord. Aug. 8.
EVANS, WILLIAM M., Cardiff. Cardiff. Pet. July 30. Ord. Aug. 12.
FOX, JOHN W., Huddersfield, Builder. Huddersfield. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
FOWELL, HENRY, Cwmgwrn, Treorchy, Fruiterer. Pontypridd. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
H. & F. ACHENBACH, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Cycle Dealers. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. June 3. Ord. Aug. 6.
HALLAS, ARTHUR, Newbury, Florist. Truro. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
HALL, EDWARD W., Wellow, Somerset, Railway Signaller. Bath. Pet. July 30. Ord. Aug. 13.
HAY, JOHN R., Kingston-upon-Hull, Labourer. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. Aug. 9. Ord. Aug. 9.
HOGAT, WILLIAM, Tinsley, Mon., Licensed Victualler. Tinsley. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
HOLLER, HARRY, Bradford, Wholesale Fruiterer. Bradford. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
HOWELL, E. J. M., Aldershot, Court Dressmaker. High Court. Pet. July 15. Ord. Aug. 12.
HUGHES, ALFRED F., Ewington, Surrey, Pig Farmer. Guildford. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.

DIASLEY, JOHN W., Goolie, Druggist. Wakefield. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
IRVINE, J. & Co., Blackpool, Timber Factors. Burnley. Pet. July 29. Ord. Aug. 12.
JACKSON, CHARLES W., New Kent-rd., Motor Engineer. High Court. Pet. July 16. Ord. Aug. 13.
JARMAN, W. W., Kneeworth, Cambridge. Luton. Pet. July 28. Ord. Aug. 12.
JEE, WILLIAM, Coventry, Confectioner. Coventry. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
JOHNS, W. H., Brighton, Schoolmaster. Brighton. Pet. July 21. Ord. Aug. 8.
KNIGHT, THOMAS, Loughborough, Railway Engineer. Leicester. Pet. July 18. Ord. Aug. 11.
LANORAN, GEORGE F., Hincley, Hosiery Manufacturer. Leicester. Pet. July 7. Ord. Aug. 11.
LAWTON, CHARLES A., Milford Haven, Gas Engineer. Haverfordwest. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
LEVY, JACQUES, Didsbury, Manchester, Cotton Manufacturer. Manchester. Pet. July 31. Ord. Aug. 13.
LADBROOK, PERCY E., Romford, Essex. Chelmsford. Pet. July 15. Ord. Aug. 11.
MATLAND, HECTOR Leigh, Confectioner. Bolton. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
MORRIS, ERNEST, Ferryhill Village, Durham, Boot Retailer. Durham. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
MORGAN, GEORGE E., Hereford, Wool Merchant. Hereford. Pet. July 29. Ord. Aug. 11.
NIGHTSCALES, HENRY, Kingston-upon-Hull, Salesman. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
O'FARRELL, JOHN W., New Cavendish-st., Doctor of Medicine. High Court. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
OLDFIELD, ELLIS, Salford, Wholesale Confectioner. Salford. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
OLDFIELD, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Colliery Proprietor. Sheffield. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
ORMOND, ALBERT E., Llanelly, Plumber. Carmarthen. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
PESPOD, THOMAS Patcham, Sussex, Coachman. Brighton. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
PLEASANTS, BENJAMIN, Great Grimsby, Grocer. Great Grimsby. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
PROCTOR, ARTHUR, Bradford, Painter. Bradford. Pet. Aug. 9. Ord. Aug. 9.
REYNOLDS, PERCY, Stratford, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
SCOTT, R. A., Lindfield, Sussex. Brighton. Pet. July 18. Ord. Aug. 12.
SHIMMOOT, BARRETT, Dalston, General Merchant. High Court. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
STONKLEY, ALFRED G., Sheffield, Haulage Contractor. Sheffield. Pet. July 22. Ord. Aug. 11.
SYMMONS, THOMAS, Sutton, Surrey, Butcher. Croydon. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
THOMPSON, THOMAS F., Cannon-st., Shipper's Manager. High Court. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
THOMAS, PERCY U., Bedford, Traveller. Bedford. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
WADE, BERTIE A., Sheffield, Upholsterer. Sheffield. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
WALKER, ARCHIBALD W., Chesterfield, Fish Merchant. Chesterfield. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
WARRINGTON, WILLIAM, Manchester, Motor Engineer. Manchester. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
WOOHER, HENRY, Coventry, Engine Fitter. Coventry. Pet. Aug. 11. Ord. Aug. 11.
YATES, JOSEPH H., Storrington, nr. Worthing, Chemist's Manager. Brighton. Pet. July 23. Ord. Aug. 8.
Amended Notice substituted for that published in the *London Gazette* of July 29, 1924:—
SINCLAIR, STAFFORD, Salford, Engineer. Salford. Pet. July 1. Ord. Aug. 25.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, August 19.

BENNETT, JOHN F., Raingate, Photographer. Canterbury. Pet. Aug. 16. Ord. Aug. 16.
BRAMFELD, CHARLES L., Rawmarsh, near Rotherham, Shocing and Jobbing Smith. Sheffield. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
BRECK, ERNEST C., Cheltenham. Cheltenham. Pet. June 30. Ord. Aug. 13.
BURNAS, MYER, Pontypool, Tailor. Newport (Mon.). Pet. June 8. Ord. Aug. 15.
BURN, HAROLD E., Crowborough, Builder. Tunbridge Wells. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
CHIS, QUONG, Liverpool, Laundry Proprietor. Liverpool. Pet. July 30. Ord. Aug. 15.
CHARKTON, ROBERT S., Ferryhill, Durham, Builder. Durham. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
CLARKE, ARTHUR L. C., Crawley. Brighton. Pet. June 14. Ord. Aug. 15.
DOMINY, FREDERICK W., Shirley, Southampton, Cycle and Motor Engineer. Southampton. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
EAL, WILLIAM T., and HORSLEY, CHARLES A., Llandudno, Electrical Engineers. Bangor. Pet. Aug. 16. Ord. Aug. 16.
ENMOTT, RICHARD, Bradford, Contractor. Bradford. Pet. July 25. Ord. Aug. 15.
EVANS, JOHN I., and EVANS, OSCAR, Swansea, Engineers. Swansea. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
FIREY, JAMES F., Richmond, Yorks, Gramophone Dealer. Northallerton. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
FRANKS, WILLIAM, Westcliff-on-Sea, Chelmsford. Pet. June 30. Ord. Aug. 14.
GIBBS, GEORGE I., Saxmundham, Coal Merchant. Ipswich. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
GREENT, FRANK, Farnworth, near Bolton, Confectioner. Bolton. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
HAGUE, WILLIAM, Stockport, Bootmaker. Stockport. Pet. Aug. 2. Ord. Aug. 15.
HARRISON, SELLIE, and DAVIES, ETHEL, Bournemouth, Hotel Proprietors. Bridgewater. Pet. July 30. Ord. Aug. 14.
HIGGINS, ARTHUR G., Bolton, Surrey, Workhouse Master. Croydon. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING FOR BLIND AND CRIPPLED GIRLS In connection with **JOHN GROOM'S CRIPPLEAGE AND FLOWER GIRLS' MISSION**

(Registered under the Blind Persons Act 1920). Incorporated Formerly known as Watercress and Flower Girls' Christian Mission.
Sept. and Sec. **ALFRED G. GROOM, E.C.**
The Cripples, 10, St. George-st., London, E.C.
Treas. **ERNEST J. LOVELL, Esq.** Bankers, BARCLAY & CO.
Afflicted Girls are received from all parts of the Kingdom without payment or votes, and are trained to become self-supporting.
Subscriptions, Donations and Testamentary Bequests are earnestly appealed for.

FOUNDED 1860.

PLEASE HELP WITH
DONATION OR
LEGACY.

THE DOGS' HOME
BATTERSEA.
Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.
The Largest Institution for Stray Dogs and Cats.
Secretary: G. GUY S. ROWLEY.

SPURGEON'S ORPHAN HOMES

STOCKWELL, LONDON, S.W.5.
Seaside Home Branch: BIRCHINGTON-ON-SEA.
President and Director, Rev. CHARLES SPURGEON, Vice-President and Treasurer, WILLIAM HIGGS, Esq.
HOME AND SCHOOL for 500 FATHERLESS CHILDREN, and a Memorial of the Beloved Founder, C. H. Spurgeon. No votes required. The most needy and deserving cases are selected by the Committee of Management.
Contributions should be sent to the Secretary, F. G. LANE, Spurgeon's Orphan Homes, Stockwell, London, S.W.1.
NOTICE TO INTENDING BENEFACTORS.—On last Annual Report, containing a Legal Form of Bequest, will be gladly sent on application to the Secretary.

HILL, CLIFTON, Hereford, Amusement Caterer. Hereford. Pet. July 28. Ord. Aug. 14.
HIRST, HARRY J., Blackpool, Salesman. Blackpool. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
HOPPER, HARRY J., Canterbury, Fishmonger. Canterbury. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
JONES, THOMAS H., King's Stag, Dorset, Grocer. Dorchester. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
KING, MAURICE, Berwick-st., Rag and Woollen Merchant. High Court. Pet. July 14. Ord. Aug. 13.
KOSKIER, REUBEN, Brick-lane, Draper. High Court. Pet. July 23. Ord. Aug. 13.
KNYVETT, CHARLES L., Brighton. Brighton. Pet. May 11. Ord. Aug. 14.
LAWRENCE, ERNEST A., Worcester, Picture Framers and Dealer. Worcester. Pet. Aug. 12. Ord. Aug. 12.
LOCKYER, COLIN, Fenton, Staffs, Motorbus Proprietor. Hanley. Pet. Aug. 2. Ord. Aug. 14.
MCNAUGHT, ALBERT J., Fleetwood, Metal Broker. Blackpool. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
MACRAE, CAPT. K. S., Bruton-place, W. High Court. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
MANGOLD, LOUIS A., and MANGOLD, CHARLES B., Harrogate, E.C., Chemical Merchants. High Court. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 18.
MILLS, T., & Son, Highgate, Builders. Birmingham. Pet. July 22. Ord. Aug. 14.
MITCHELL, JAMES, and MITCHELL, CLAUDE R., Wadebridge, Cornwall, Bakers. Truro. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
MORRIS, WILLIAM A., Padham, Motor Engineer. Burnley. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
PEARSON, RALPH, Middleton, Cloth Stiffener and Finisher. Oldham. Pet. Aug. 16. Ord. Aug. 16.
ROBERTS, WILLIAM J., Redruth, Wholesale Tea and Provision Dealer. Truro. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
SIMMONS, GEORGE T., Uckfield, Cycle Dealer. Brighton. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
STANWAY, RICHARD G., Wellington, Corn Dealer. Shrewsbury. Pet. Aug. 13. Ord. Aug. 13.
WARREN, HARRY, Leamington, Fried Fish Dealer. Warwick. Pet. July 30. Ord. Aug. 15.
WATSON, WALTER J., Rugby, Hairdresser. Coventry. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
WHEATCROFT, ALICE M., Blackpool, Milliner. Blackpool. Pet. Aug. 14. Ord. Aug. 14.
WILSON, REX, Clapham, Film Photographer. Wandsworth. Pet. July 7. Ord. Aug. 14.
WOOD, JOHN, and WOOD, FRED, Huddersfield, Farmers. Huddersfield. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
WOODCOCK, CECIL F., Newington, Kent, Nurseryman. Rochester. Pet. Aug. 15. Ord. Aug. 15.
YORK, LESLIE E. L., North Kensington. High Court. Pet. July 16. Ord. Aug. 14.
Amended Notice substituted for that published in the *London Gazette* of August 5, 1924:—
NYMES, MATILDA, Newark, Draper. Nottingham. Pet. July 16. Ord. July 30.